(3)

SINGLE BENCH

CF 100/-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR(C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 2679/2005

PETITIONER : Akhilesh Shukla, S/o. Shri Sushil Shukla, aged 44 years, Occupation-Service, presently working as Junior Auditor, in the State of Chhattisgarh, Mandi,Board, R/o. Coal Survey Lab., P.O. Mangla, Distt. Bilaspur, (C.G.) Presenty Residing at Shankar Nagar Raipur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 2789/05 Presented by Shri Sanjay Dhir dated 22/6/05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Union of India, Through Secretary, Department of Personnel & Training, Ministry of Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. Public Sector undertaking committee, Through its President, State Re-organisation cell, General Administration, Department, State of M.P. Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)
3. State of M.P. Through Secretary, Department of Agricultural, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)
4. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Agricultural, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
5. C.G.State, Agricultural Marketing Board, Through its Managing Director, Purana Ganj Mandi Parisar, Raipur (C.G.)
6. M.P. State Agricultural Marketing Board, Through its Managing Director, Arera Hills, Jail Road, Kishan Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.).

22/6/05

R/C Shankpur 22/6/05

THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

22/6/05

(9)

WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT, ORDERS OR DIRECTION.

85

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.2679 OF 2005

Petitioner : Akhilesh Shukla

versus

Respondents : Union of India and others

Present : Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner.
Ms. Sharmila Singhai, counsel for respondent No.1.
Mr. Sachin Singh Rajput, counsel for respondents No.2 and 3.
Mr. V.V.S.Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State of Chhattisgarh/respondent No.4.
None for respondents No.5 and 6.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st Day of February, 2007)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the writ petition has become infructuous.

2. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal